Case 1:08-cv-10420-KBF Document 174 Filed 10/20/14 Page 1 of 2

PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP

1285 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10019-6064

TELEPHONE (212) 373-3000

LLOYD K. GARRISON (1946-1991) RANDOLPH E. PAUL (1946-1956) SIMON H. RIFKIND (1950-1995) LOUIS S. WEISS

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NUMBER

212-373-3203

WRITER'S DIRECT FACSIMILE

212-492-0203

WRITER'S DIRECT E-MAIL ADDRESS

aarffa@paulweiss.com

UNIT 3601, OFFICE TOWER A, BEIJING FORTUNE PLAZA NO. 7 DONGSANHUAN ZHONGLU CHAOYANG DISTRICT BEIJING 100020 PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA TELEPHONE (86-10) 5828-6300

> 12TH FLOOR, HONG KONG CLUB BUILDING 3A CHATER ROAD, CENTRAL HONG KONG TELEPHONE (852) 2846-0300

> > ALDER CASTLE 10 NOBLE STREET LONDON EC2V 7-HL U.K. TELEPHONE (44 20) 7367 1600

FUKOKU SEIMEI BUILDING 2-2 UCHISAIWAICHO 2-CHOME CHIYODA-KU, TOKYO 100-0011, JAPAN TELEPHONE (81-3) 3597-8101

TORONTO-DOMINION CENTRE 77 KING STREET WEST, SUITE 3100 P.O. BOX 226 TORONTO, ONTARIO M5K 1J3 TELEPHONE (416) 504-0520

> 2001 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1047 TELEPHONE (202) 223-7300

500 DELAWARE AVENUE, SUITE 200 POST OFFICE BOX 32 WILMINGTON, DE 19899-0032 TELEPHONE (302) 655-4410

October 20, 2014

TTHEW W. ABBOTT
LAN J. ARFFA
BERT A. ATKINS
VID J. BALL
HN F. BAUGHMAN
NN B. BAYARD
HN F. BAYARD
R. BERGMAN
UCE BIRENBOIM
MES L. BROCHIN
HARD J. BRONSTEIN
VID W. BROWN
HARD J. BRONSTEIN
VID W. BAYARD
REICK S. CAMPBELL*
RICK S JOMASS, DE LA BASTIII
RIEL J. DECKELBAUM
LICE BELISLE EATON
NOREW J. EHRLICH
REGORY A. EZRING
REGORY A. FILL
DER C. FINCH
REGORY
REG J. FOLEY
FREIDUS
FREY
GAINES
A. GALLO
I. GERTZMAN
IVERTZ
E GOCT NNETH A. GALLO
CHAEL E. GERTZMAN
CHAEL E. GERTZMAN
CHAEL GOGLIORMELLA
BERT D. GOLDBAUM
IL GOLDMAN
IC GOODISON
ADLES L COOGE IB C GOODISON

RLES H. GOOGE, JR.

PREW G. GORDON

GROFMAN

HOLAS GROOMBRIDGE

JCE A. GUTENPLAN

NES GWATHMEY, III

N.S. HALPERIN HALPERIN 3. HAMILL 1. HAMMERMAN E. HARPER HERMANN M. HIRSH E. HIRSHMAN I. S. HONG

SON VARADY OH JKUN D. PARKER PERLMUTTER E. RADWANER REISNER G. RICCIARDI RIEMAN A. ROSEN A. ROSEN N. ROSENBERG INE MAN M. RUSSO M. RUSSO H. SAFF M. RUSSO"

I M. SACKSTEDER

SAFERSTEIN

SAMUELS

ARRO
CHIMEK
M. SCHNEIDER

SCHUMER

CHWAB

OUTT HIMSHAK JLAR RMAN о́иs EL OWAY TAG WART ONE NOFSKY ZQUEZ VULLO DRA M. WALSH* ICE G. WEE RE V. WELLS, JR. WILKINSON J. WILLIAMS ICE I. WILDORCHIC WLAZLO ASON WOOD E. YARETT YOSHINO RACEY A. ZACCONE ROBERT ZOCHOWSKI, JR.

By E-mail and ECF

The Honorable Katherine B. Forrest Daniel Patrick Movnihan United States Courthouse 500 Pearl Street New York, NY 10007-1312

> Allianz Risk Transfer AG, et al. v. Paramount Pictures Corporation, No. 08-CV-10420 (KBF)

Dear Judge Forrest:

This firm, together with Kendall, Brill and Kleiger LLP, represents the defendant, Paramount Pictures Corporation ("Paramount") in this action. We write briefly in response to plaintiffs' letter in support of their Rule 39(b) motion, because it fundamentally misapprehends the law in this Circuit.

As the authorities cited in our letter of earlier this afternoon make clear, the Second Circuit, for cases initially filed in federal court, has adopted a "rigid rule" prohibiting the revival of a jury trial right once waived, where that waiver, as it does here, stems from mere inadvertence. Alvarado v. Santana-Lopez, 101 F.R.D. 367, 368 (S.D.N.Y. 1984). That rule derives from Judge Friendly's opinion in Noonan v. Cunard S.S. Co., 375 F.2d 69, 70 (2d Cir. 1970). And to be clear, in their letter plaintiffs offer no reason for their failure to assert their jury trial rights. There is no reason, then, under Noonan, to permit the belated jury trial demand. This should be the end of the inquiry.

PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP

The Honorable Katherine B. Forrest

2

What plaintiffs' letter fails to explain is that there are *two* lines of authority in this Circuit under Rule 39(b). The Court of Appeals made this clear in *Cascone* v. *Ortho Pharmaceutical Corp.*, 702 F.3d 389, 393 (2d Cir. 1983). There, the court expressly held that *Noonan* "shall continue to govern cases where it is applicable," but further held that there was more "play in the joints" for cases removed from New York Supreme Court. *Id.* The courts in the Second Circuit have shown greater solicitude for belated jury demands, and applied a multi-factor test, in cases removed from New York Supreme Court because CPLR § 4102(a) provides that a jury demand can be made at any time up to the filing of the pre-trial note of issue.

The multi-factor test cited by plaintiffs in their letter has its roots in *Higgins* v. *Boeing Co.*, 526 F.2d 1004 (2d Cir 1975), a case that was removed from New York Supreme Court, and indeed plaintiffs' own authorities—which themselves include removed cases, applying the test with its roots in *Higgins*—make that very clear. *See, e.g., Gold & Rosenblatt LLC* v. *JP Morgan Chase, N.A.*, 2012 WL 1624032, at *1 (A case removed from New York Supreme Court, in which the court rejected the "more stringent" *Noonan* standard because the case was not filed in federal court in the first instance, and held that that "[t]he Court applies a case-by-case approach in determining whether to allow a late-filed jury demand in *removed* cases" (emphasis added) (citing *Cascone*)); *see also Encarnacion* v. *Isabella Geriatric Center*, 2014 WL 4494160 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 11, 2014) (applying multi-factor test in a case *removed* from New York Supreme Court, and noting the distinction between the two standards).

In addition, plaintiffs offer an exceedingly cramped and illogical interpretation of the Subscription Agreement. Clearly, in this suit, the plaintiffs are enforcing what they believe are their rights under the securities at issue.

For all of these reasons, and the reasons set forth in our earlier letter, plaintiffs' Rule 39(b) motion should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

Allan J. Arff

cc: All counsel of record (by e-mail)